

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview with Applicant's Representatives, Rob Hartman and Kristi Kuhnert, on October 17, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's Representatives discussed proposed amendments to the independent claims for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection.

The Examiner was receptive to the proposal of incorporating language of or similar to dependent claim 6 into that of independent claims 1 and 10. The Examiner was also receptive to incorporating features proposed by the Applicant into independent claim 15. The Examiner agreed that the cited references lack features of each of the independent claims as amended and, as such, that such amendments would at least overcome the outstanding rejections.

Applicant herein amends each of the independent claims as discussed during the interview. Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,639,943 (Radha) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,811 (Rose) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,233 (Takashima). This rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, for at least the reasons outlined below. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 15 and has canceled claims 6 and 11 for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

Independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the language of dependent claim 6. As amended, claim 1 recites a method of processing media content, the method comprising:

- generating a motion compensated prediction of a region of media content;
- receiving an indication of whether there are first and second quantities of residual samples remaining for refining the prediction, on a per-region basis, wherein the indication comprises one or more values associated with one or more picture-level parameters; and
- adding of the first quantity of residual samples to the prediction to generate a refined prediction value, when so indicated;
- subtracting the second quantity of residual samples from the refined prediction value to generate a final representation, when so indicated;
- sending any prediction control information necessary for generation of a motion compensated predicted region to an accelerator;

- sending an indication to the accelerator of whether the first and second quantities of residual samples are to be applied; and
- performing subsequent processing and/or rendering at the accelerator.

In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Radha in view of Rose and in further view of Takashima. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, claim 1 is amended to recite, “a method of processing media content, the method comprising...sending any prediction control information necessary for generation of a motion compensated predicted region to an accelerator; sending an indication to the accelerator of whether the first and second quantities of residual samples are to be applied; and performing subsequent processing and/or rendering at the accelerator.” Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, and Takashima, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined), do not teach or suggest this method. Applicant thus respectfully submits that this claim stands allowable.

Applicant notes that the Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references did not teach or suggest this claim element. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication. The Examiner also indicated that he would review the references and update his search.

Claims 2-5 and 7-9 depend from independent claim 1 and each, therefore, includes all the features of independent claim 1, as well as the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7-9 are allowable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of

argument that the documents can even be combined), by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 10 is amended to incorporate the language of dependent claim 11. As amended, claim 10 recites:

- One or more computer-readable storage media having computer-readable instructions stored thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement a decoder of media content to generate a motion compensated prediction of at least a region of media content, to receive an indication of one or more sets of samples of residual information to further refine the prediction, wherein the indication comprises one or more values associated with one or more picture-level parameters, and to add a first set of such samples to the prediction to generate a modified prediction, if indicated, and to subtract a second set of such samples from the modified prediction to generate a final motion compensated prediction of the region, if indicated, and wherein the executable instructions on the storage medium cause prediction control information necessary for generation of the motion compensated prediction and the indications of whether the first and/or second quantity of residual samples are to be applied and the actual first and second sets of residual samples to be sent to a communicatively coupled accelerator for subsequent processing and/or rendering.

In making out the rejection of claim 10, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Radha in view of Rose and in further view of Takashima. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, claim 10 is amended to recite, “executable instructions on [a] storage medium [that] cause prediction control information necessary for generation of the motion compensated prediction and the indications of whether the first and/or second

quantity of residual samples are to be applied and the actual first and second sets of residual samples to be sent to a communicatively coupled accelerator for subsequent processing and/or rendering.” Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, and Takashima, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined), do not teach or suggest this computer-readable instruction. Applicant thus respectfully submits that this claim stands allowable.

Applicant notes that the Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references did not teach or suggest this claim element. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication. The Examiner also indicated that he would review the references and update his search.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 10 and each, therefore, includes all the features of independent claim 10, as well as the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, claims 12-14 are allowable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined), by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 15 is amended and, as amended, recites a system implemented at least in part on a computing device, comprising:

- a decoder application to receive a region of media content and control generation of decoded media content; and
- an application program interface (API), communicatively coupling the decoder application with a hardware accelerator by way of at least one of a plurality of autonegotiation structures, wherein if the API receives an indication of one or more sets of residual samples,

the first set of samples is added to a motion compensated prediction to generate a refinement of a prediction value, when so indicated, and a second set of samples is subtracted from the refined prediction value to generate a final representation, when so indicated.

In making out the rejection of claim 15, the Office argues that its subject matter is obvious over Radha in view of Rose and in further view of Takashima. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, claim 15 is amended to recite, "an application program interface (API), communicatively coupling the decoder application with a hardware accelerator by way of at least one of a plurality of autonegotiation structures...." Applicant respectfully submits that Radha, Rose, and Takashima, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined), do not teach or suggest this system. Applicant thus respectfully submits that this claim stands allowable.

Applicant notes that the Examiner agreed during the above-referenced interview that the cited references did not teach or suggest this claim element. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication. The Examiner also indicated that he would review the references and update his search.

Claims 16-20 depend from independent claim 15 and each, therefore, includes all the features of independent claim 15, as well as the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, claims 16-20 are allowable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined), by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2007/10/22

By: 

Robert G. Hartman
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265